

The point is that there has been no cooperation extended. There has been a lot of rhetoric, and that is the end of it. Mrs. Helms raised a dumb son, maybe, but she did not raise a stupid one. I understand the name of the game. The administration and its supporters have wanted this bill to die a quiet death. It is not going to die. It is going back on the calendar, but it will return. Just as MacArthur said, I will return, the administration can count on this bill's return.

I will enjoy the Tuesdays and Thursdays when we normally have business sessions of the Foreign Relations Committee. The bill will not be killed with the administration's tactic. It is going to keep coming back and back and back until we get a vote. If the Senate votes down the bill, fine. That is fair enough. Or, if there is a move by Members of the Senate on the other side who want to present a concrete alternative, that will be fine. Or, if we can get now what we did not get before, a commitment from the Vice President of the United States—you know, the fellow who is in charge of reinvention of Government—that he and his associates will work with us, that will be fine. If the President of the United States indicates that he wants some ambassadors cleared and he wants his representatives in the Senate to cooperate in jointly producing a bill, that will be fine.

But I appreciate the Senators on the Republican side, and I appreciate my good friend, Senator PELL, for having voted for cloture in both instances today.

At a later time, I will have more to say, and I thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

#### MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 908

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have indicated at our policy luncheon that this bill will probably be brought up at a later time. But I would now ask unanimous consent that the Department of State reorganization be placed back on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Again, let me say to my colleague from North Carolina that we have indicated to him that this would be back up again. We discussed that with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Rhode Island. It is an important bill. But I think in the spirit of trying to get some things done—we can get on hopefully with part of the recess—this is the best course to follow.

So I thank my colleague from North Carolina for his agreeing with that procedure.

There will be votes throughout the day.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would just like to say to the majority leader and to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I respect and appreciate the decision of the majority leader with respect to the bill that was just on the floor, but I want the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to know that the quote he read has already been disavowed. It is not the policy of the Democratic side, and that is not what we are trying to do with respect to this bill.

I would be happy to engage with the Senator further as we have previous to this to try to see if we can arrive at some kind of understanding. It is an important piece of legislation. We are not trying to avoid it altogether. But I think it was premature in its current state, and we would be happy to work with the Senator from North Carolina in an effort to see if we can come up with a reasonable bipartisan approach.

#### THE SENATE'S SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Let me indicate to my colleagues now what we would like to do between now and the 12th of August—hopefully by the 12th, if not beyond the 12th; that is, to complete action on the energy and water appropriations, to complete action on the DOD authorization bill, to complete action on welfare reform, to complete action on the DOD appropriations bill, and I am advised by Senators STEVENS and INOUE—we had a meeting in my office this morning—that could be done in one day. Marty was there, I might add, the Democratic leader's representative. It was not a party meeting. They said what we could do. And there is also a hope, because we have had some conversations that there may be renewed interest in getting some agreement, if possible, on reg reform, that we can either finish it before we leave for the recess, or finish it when we are back.

So I would just say in the spirit of everybody trying, I know there are going to be important amendments, and I know they want them to be debated. Everybody has that right.

According to the appropriators, the DOD appropriators, many of these amendments that are going to be taken care of in DOD authorization we will treat the same in the appropriations bill. It might speed up the process. So that would be very helpful.

I say to the Democratic leader, I do not think we have tried to pile up too much here if everything goes well and if we all cooperate on both sides. Most of these issues involved are not partisan issues. They are policy issues where you have Republicans and Democrats, particularly in DOD, maybe in this energy and water, you have Republicans and some Democrats on each side of the issues, so they are not partisan issues. There should not be any partisan roadblocks that I know of. I

am not as familiar with the bills as obviously the managers are.

So we will now move to energy and water. And I will be very happy to yield to the distinguished Democratic leader if he wanted to make any comments.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would subscribe to what the majority leader indicated. None of the legislation contemplated for completion except perhaps welfare reform—we will have to see where we are on that, but I think by and large the legislation pending is all legislation that I am hopeful we can work through.

I am not as optimistic about the degree to which we can work through these very significant amendments on DOD unless we have some understanding as to what the timeframe may be and whether or not some of these amendments could be offered as amendments to defense appropriations, but there are very serious questions here that have to be addressed. And I think Members ought to expect long days and a Saturday session in order for us to accomplish all that the leader has set out for us to accomplish in the next week and a half.

Mr. DOLE. There will be a Saturday session. I appreciate the Democrat leader mentioning that.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate business is the energy and water appropriation bill, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate that we are going to try to finish this energy and water appropriations bill today. I have been advised by the managers that they think that can be done. They have resolved one of the contentious issues.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I should like to address one portion of that bill for just a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, as we recommence the debate on the appropriations for energy and water, I should like to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of that appropriations subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico, and his colleague, the Senator from Louisiana, for the thoughtful and generous treatment they have accorded to two projects in the State of Washington that are of great importance to that State. The subcommittee has approved and the Senate is now considering funding for the Yakima River Basin water enhancement project and the Columbia

Basin project. Each of them is beneficial both to irrigators and fish and wildlife and the Yakima Indian Nation in central Washington.

Last year, under the leadership of the Senator from Louisiana, Congress passed authorizing legislation creating the Yakima River Basin water enhancement project. This program will fund water conservation and storage measures which will secure irrigation water supplies for farmers, help salmon populations in the basin, and be of considerable benefit to the Yakima Indian Nation as well.

Specific programs within the project are the Cle Elum Reservoir, the Chandler pumping and powerplant, the Kachess Dam and Reservoir, irrigation and instream flow studies, enhancement of tributaries water supplies and environmental compliance activities.

Further down the river, the Columbia Basin funding will help complete that project's drainage system. It will assure a sustainable irrigation project that will be able to meet its Federal repayment obligations and generate the project's intended social, environmental, and economic benefits. Once a drainage inventory is finished, local irrigation districts and the local Bureau of Reclamation office will be able to expedite work and reduce overhead burdens to finally complete the drainage system, saving taxpayer dollars in the long run.

Mr. President, as we all know, weather is an uncertain thing. And if you are a farmer faced with a drought, your entire livelihood is in jeopardy. Washington State is no stranger to severe water shortages, and funding for these projects will make water supply more certain for farmers within their areas.

These projects also improve conditions for fish. Already, at the Yakima project, fish passage facilities have been installed at project dams and screens have been placed at irrigation diversions.

I am truly pleased that the Senate subcommittee and full committee have approved funding for the Yakima enhancement and Columbia Basin projects. Both are excellent measures for helping Washington State agriculture.

I encourage support for the overall bill and once again thank the two managers of the bill.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we are now on the energy and water appropriations bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Tennessee wants to wait a couple of minutes on the committee amendments, and we are going to obviously wait for that. But I might say to Senators that have expressed an interest in amendments, the leader has asked us to get this bill finished tonight, and there are two Senators who have told me they have amendments. I hope they could get here in the next few minutes and we can get a reasonable time agreement and vote on them.

Senator BUMPERS indicated he had a gas-cooled reactor amendment. Maybe we could just ask Senator BUMPERS' office if he could come down and offer that and do that rather quickly. Senator JEFFORDS on the Republican side has a renewable resource amendment.

If Senator JEFFORDS could come down and share that with us so we can move quickly with it. We are working up some amendments that we are going to make en bloc for various Members. But we cannot do anything on the committee amendments until we get word from the Senator from Tennessee who has a hold on those committee amendments.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. Indeed, I would be pleased to yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the difficult things on this bill—which are nuclear waste in Nevada—we hope the new spallation source will be worked out. We believe that the Princeton problem has been worked out. The difficult things, those that would have tied us up for a long time, I believe have been worked out. And it is my hope that dealing with two fairly short amendments, we will be ready to go to final passage.

I ask the Senator from New Mexico, does he not share my view that we ought to be able to go to final passage very shortly?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, unless there are Senators that have not conferred with me—and I have had plenty of notes given to me; we are working on most of them—I think most of them are solved. I think that conclusion is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would, from my standpoint, like to put Senators on notice that if they have something they want in the bill, something to go in the managers' amendment, please contact us so we can put it in, because we may be ready to wrap up, we hope, early this afternoon.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Robert Simon be allowed the privilege of the floor during consideration of H.R. 1905, the energy and water appropriations bill, and any votes thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to, en bloc, except as to the amendment found on page 23, line 7, and the amendment found on page 38, line 19, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded as original text for the purpose of further amendment, provided that no point of order shall have been waived by agreeing to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. (The committee amendments are printed in the RECORD of July 31, 1995.)

EXCEPTED COMMITTEE AMENDMENT BEGINNING ON PAGE 23, LINE 7

Mr. DOMENICI. Now, Mr. President, as I understand it, the first committee amendment which I exempted from that unanimous-consent request is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 2053 TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT BEGINNING ON PAGE 23, LINE 7 (Purpose: To amend the provision relating to the expansion of a facility for the storage of uranium)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] for Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 2053 to the committee amendment on page 23, line 7.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 24, line 7, strike "135(a)(2), 135(d), 135(e), 141(g), 145" and insert "135(d), 135(e),".

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this has been agreed to by the two Senators from Nevada, myself, and the ranking member. I have no objection to its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, this has been worked out with the two Senators from Nevada. We support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2053) was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I believe we are working with Senator JEFFORDS and his staff regarding an amendment that he has. I ask Senator BUMPERS and his cosponsor if they could be ready in a few minutes. We could take that amendment and get the debate, and maybe there is a vote needed on that.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mark Turner, who is a Javits Fellow detailed to the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, be allowed floor privileges during the debate of the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I believe, through oversight, after amending the first committee amendment, I did not proceed to have that amendment adopted, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment beginning on page 23, line 7, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I move to table the motion.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] has an amendment on behalf of himself and three other Senators. We are going to accept the amendment. He is going to modify it and then send it up. He agrees to speak up to 15 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, if I may respond.

Mr. DOMENICI. Of course.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes, that is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent there are 15 minutes on the amendment and then we proceed to a vote on the amendment, and we intend to accept it at the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I will be proposing an amendment very shortly which will help maintain the United States support for its solar and wind power. It would restore \$25 million and offset this by reducing funding for the Department of Energy's operations budget.

Mr. President, the Energy Policy Act of 1992 began to outline an energy security strategy for our country. As I have argued many times before, energy security is vital to our economy and our national security. I believe that renewable energy resources are important components of our energy security strategy and must not be compromised.

The United States now imports in excess of 50 percent of the oil we use to power our homes, automobiles and workplaces. This is a national security concern, and our dependence on foreign sources of energy is an economic security risk.

Mr. President, every month the Commerce Department releases its statistics on the balance of our trade. The numbers are very grim. We are running huge trade deficits, and oil imports are a major reason why. Imports of oil constitute an enormous drag on our balance of payments and serve only to export U.S. jobs abroad.

In contrast, more than one-half of the manufacturing capacity of the U.S. solar industry is geared to exports. Northern Power Systems from my State of Vermont markets wind turbine technologies around the globe. If a city, town or power system in Saudi Arabia wants to build a wind turbine, they call Waitsfield, VT. Nevertheless, without adequate Federal support, the United States leads in developing renewable energy technologies will slip.

The U.S. Information Agency predicts that the worldwide market for renewables and efficiency technologies will equal \$280 billion through the year 2010. However, they also point out that at the current rate of growth, the United States will capture less than 8 percent of this market. Why? Because Europe and Japan are funneling more and more money to their renewable companies in the form of capital financing and export promotion. And that export promotion is what does the most damage, especially deals they can give.

Mr. President, despite the proven successes of renewable energy programs and their overwhelming public support, the renewable accounts have been hit disproportionately hard in

this bill. Funding for wind, solar, and biomass programs have been cut 27 percent from the fiscal year 1995 levels compared to a 15-percent cut in the Department of Energy's overall energy supply research and development accounts.

We have made commitments to many small companies through public and private partnerships to drive renewables research and development to the marketplace. We are just entering year 3 of a 5-year commitment to the solar and wind field. To pull the plug now would constitute a serious abrogation of our commitment and undermine much of the progress we have witnessed in the past few years.

In this time of fiscal constraint, hard choices must be made, and I agree with many of them. But solar and wind programs are working. These programs have enormous nationwide benefits for a very small investment. For example, the DOE wind program is working closely with Kotzbue Electric Association 30 miles inside the Arctic Circle in Alaska to supply reliable wind energy and reduce dependence on diesel generators. The Florida Solar Energy Center in Cape Canaveral works with more than 100 solar manufacturers, resulting in significant exports to Latin America. The AWT-26, one of the world's most advanced wind turbines, is being developed by former Boeing engineers outside of Seattle, WA.

Mr. President, we are pushing forward, working to lead this booming global market, and we will succeed if Congress maintains its commitment to wind and solar research and development. The money that is spent on renewable energy programs has a direct impact on this country's bottom line. Overall, we can expect more than \$4 billion in annual fuel cost savings by the year 2000, more than \$8 billion by the year 2010, and nearly \$26 billion by the year 2020. Solar, biomass, wind and geothermal energy systems will also create many thousands of jobs by the year 2000.

This amendment simply asks the Department of Energy to speed up implementation of the strategic alignment and downsizing plan, thereby reducing administrative costs. Currently, the Department spends \$377 million for general management and program support functions.

One of the largest pieces of this budget is the field operations offices. These offices are the paperwork side of our national labs. A less than 10 percent cut of \$25 million will help do what needs to be done to keep us on track.

My amendment would shift this amount from administrative functions to support for solar, wind, and biomass programs. This money would not be used for overhead and paperwork but to finance important programs that assist small companies in the development of advanced renewable technology.

The goal we seek to accomplish today with this amendment has been recommended by the Galvin task force,

which reviewed our national labs, and the Daniel Yergin task force, which advised DOE on how to best downsize.

Mr. President, we may hear arguments today that downsizing the operations office in this matter is not wise. However, this Friday Secretary Hazel O'Leary will announce additional components of her strategic realignment plan. I expect a major component of her plan is to downsize the operations office, saving millions and millions of dollars in overhead costs.

Mr. President, what we are doing is moving money from paperwork and bureaucracy to technology and the development of science from top-down, command-and-control administration to technology transfer and international competitiveness and from duplicative management to small business. Clean economic growth is not a contradiction in terms. New generations of environmental technologies are making it possible to have both. To be truly strong, the U.S. economy must be efficient, clean, and fueled by stable supplies of energy. By voting for this amendment, the Senate will help ensure that we attain these goals.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. May I ask my friend, what was the purpose of the quorum call?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I was getting the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you.

I yield the floor.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2054

(Purpose: To provide that certain funds appropriated for the Department of Energy operations be available instead for energy supply, research and development activities relating to certain renewable energy sources)

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, at this time I offer my amendment and ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside for the purposes of consideration of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 2054.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 20, line 23 insert the following:

#### "SEC. . FUNDING FOR ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES RELATING TO RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES.

"(a) REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount appropriated in title III of this Act under the heading DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION is hereby reduced by \$37,000,000.

"(b) INCREASE IN APPROPRIATION FOR ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount appropriated in title III of this Act under the heading ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES is hereby increased by \$37,000,000.

"(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the funds appropriated in title III of this Act under the heading ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES—

"(1) not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available for solar building technology research;

"(2) not less than \$78,929,000 shall be available for photovoltaic energy systems;

"(3) not less than \$28,443,000 shall be available for solar thermal energy systems;

"(4) not less than \$55,300,000 shall be available for biofuels of which no less than half shall go toward the BIOMASS ELECTRIC PROGRAM;

"(5) not less than \$42,000,000 shall be available for wind energy systems;

"(6) not less than \$8,000,000 shall be available for international solar energy programs;

"(7) not less than \$9,000,000 shall be available for hydrogen research;"

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, today, I am sponsoring an amendment that would restore \$37 million into solar and renewable energy programs. The overall DOE energy supply account was cut 15.6 percent, while the overall renewable accounts were cut by 27 percent. My amendment would bring into line the budget reduction of the solar and renewables program to the percentage reduction level of the other DOE energy supply accounts.

This amendment would restore funding for solar and renewable energy programs at the expenses of overhead. It would transfer 37 million from DOE's departmental administration to solar and renewable energy programs. This represents a 10-percent cut in DOE's overhead. Recent studies show that we need to reduce bureaucracy, cut overhead burdens and costs to have more effective and efficient R&D programs.

The Galvin Task Force Report, recently commissioned by the Department of Energy, recommended that bold action be taken regarding the reduction of administrative oversight. The report further states, DOE should be able to accomplish a substantial reduction in oversight without reducing the dollars spent directly on R&D scientists and engineers. In addition, the Yergin Task Force also recently recommended that DOE reduce total energy R&D costs by cutting directly at administrative compliance and overhead costs. This amendment would restore funding for solar and renewable energy programs by cutting administrative costs identified in these reports.

I believe that funding renewable energy programs is an important issue to

our Nation. Renewable energy programs promise to supply economically competitive and commercially viable energy, while also assisting our Nation in reducing greenhouse gases and oil imports. The Nation should be looking toward alternative forms and sources of energy, not taking a step backward by cutting funding for these programs.

My own State of Delaware has a long tradition in solar energy. In 1972, the University of Delaware established one of the first photovoltaic laboratories in the Nation. The university has been instrumental in developing solar photovoltaic energy, the same type of energy that powers solar watches and calculators.

Delaware has a major solar energy manufacturer, Astro Power, which is now the fastest growing manufacturer of photovoltaic cells in the world. In collaboration with the University of Delaware and Astro Power, Delaware's major utility—Delmarva Power & Light—has installed an innovative solar energy system that has successfully demonstrated the use of solar power to satisfy peak electrical demand. Through this collaboration, my State has demonstrated that solar energy technology can be an economically competitive and commercially viable energy alternative for the utility industry.

It is vital that we continue to manufacture these solar cell products with the high performance, high quality, and low costs required to successfully compete worldwide. Investment in Department of Energy solar and renewable energy programs has put us on the threshold of explosive growth. Continuation of the present renewable energy programs is required to achieve the goal of a healthy photovoltaic industry in the United States. While the solar energy industries might have evolved in some form on the their own, the Federal investment has accelerated the transition from the laboratory bench to commercial markets in a way that has already accrued valuable economic benefits to the Nation.

The solar energy industries—like Astro Power—have already created thousands of jobs and helped to reduce our trade deficit through exports of solar energy systems overseas, mostly to developing nations, where two billion people are still without access to electricity.

International markets for solar energy systems are virtually exploding, due to several key market trends. Most notably, solar energy is already one of the lowest cost options available to developing countries that cannot afford to build large, expensive centralized power generation facilities with elaborate distribution systems.

The governments of Japan, Germany, and Australia are investing heavily in aggressive technology and market development in partnership with their

own solar energy industries. Until recently, Japan and Germany held the lead in world market share for photovoltaics; the United States has only recently recaptured international market dominance. Cutting funding for commercializing these technologies would have a chilling effect on the U.S. industry's ability to compete on an international scale in these billion-dollar markets of today and tomorrow. The employment potential of renewables represents a minimum of 15,000 new jobs this decade with nearly 120,000 the next decade.

It is imperative that this Senate support solar and renewable energy technologies and be a partner to an energy future that addresses our economic needs in an environmentally acceptable manner. My State has done and will continue to do its part. I hope my colleagues in the Senate will look to the future and do their part in securing a safe and reliable energy future by supporting this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2054

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Jeffords amendment and am pleased to be an original cosponsor. Over the past 2½ years, I have had the opportunity to help formulate our renewable energy policies, both as a member of the House Energy R&D Subcommittee, and now as a member of the Senate Energy Committee. This amendment represents an important step forward in our efforts.

In my home State of Minnesota, we have a strong commitment to renewable and alternative energy resources. Solar, wind, and biofuels play a key role in Minnesota's overall energy blueprint, and these priorities are shared across this Nation. Our amendment demonstrates this understanding while reducing redtape and bureaucracy at the same time.

Too many taxpayers' dollars are being wasted on bureaucracy and redtape in Washington and not on programs that help meet the energy needs of the people of Minnesota. If we are going to spend the taxpayers' money, we had better make sure it is for their benefit, and not for a bloated bureaucracy.

By slashing bureaucracy and eliminating \$25 million from departmental administration, we are able to increase the levels of funding for solar and renewables. Even DOE Secretary Hazel O'Leary endorses this type of approach—her proposal for strategic realignment estimates potential savings of nearly \$2 billion through consolidating and realignment of the current DOE structure.

Limiting the scope of Government—while expanding funding for renewable energy resources—are goals which can be achieved together, as this amendment so clearly demonstrates.

The Jeffords amendment reflects a balanced prioritization of our limited energy dollars. It is my strong hope that by maintaining a Federal commitment to solar and renewable programs,

we will be able to achieve a strong and vibrant industry that is capable of thriving in the free market.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Jeffords renewable amendment. It allows us to pursue renewable energy resources at the same time we protect the taxpayers, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of such a proposal. Thank you and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am happy to join Senator JEFFORDS as a cosponsor of his amendment to restore funding to the solar and renewable budget of the Department of Energy fiscal year 1996 spending bill.

Our amendment restores \$25 million to this vital account, boosting funding for solar, wind, and biomass energy research. Renewable energy has the potential to reduce pollution, decrease our dependence on imported fuels, and produce good paying jobs here in the United States.

The United States has the opportunity to lead the world in clean, renewable energy technology. Vermont in particular has taken the lead with the development of wind and biomass energy technology. This "green technology" has the potential to generate more than virtually pollution free energy, it generates good paying manufacturing jobs in Vermont and throughout the country.

The energy and water appropriations bill passed by the House mortgages the future of our energy program by dramatically reduced funding for the solar and renewable energy budget, cutting it by 22 percent. I think that is a short-sighted approach.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

So, the amendment (No. 2054) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for accommodating us on the floor. We are pleased to have accommodated him. But I thank him for accommodating us on time so we can move ahead with the bill and, hopefully, finish it in the next couple hours. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from New Mexico for accommodating us. This will be an important amendment to help. And I am very pleased to accommodate the committee with our promptness.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me ask that that be withheld for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to Senators that have amendments that they think are going to have to take time and perhaps be voted on, that they accommodate the leadership of the Senate, the leadership on the Democrat side and the Republican side.

Some colloquies earlier in the day indicated we wanted to get our schedule completed, especially on these issues that do not appear to be partisan in nature. So we have made a commitment to stay here tonight and finish this bill. I do not see any reason why we have to keep Senators here tonight. If Senators have amendments, please come down and offer them. I think that is only fair. So once again, I am not going to name Senators, but, please, if Senators have some amendments that they want us to consider and that clearly need debate, would they please come on down or call us and tell us?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I would be pleased to yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Very seriously, this bill should not go into tonight. The difficult things are worked out. If Senators will come down and offer these amendments, we can be gone this afternoon. And so I urge Senators not to wait until tonight. Frankly, we ought to go to third reading if Senators are not going to be here to offer their amendments.

Mr. DOMENICI. I said we pledged to get finished tonight, but it looks to me like we should be finished here early enough to get home and have dinner with our families for a change. On this bill, there were three major issues, and we have solved them, at least to the satisfaction of the Senators that contested the issues. With Senator LAUTENBERG from New Jersey, we have agreed to an amendment he has with reference to fusion energy. We solved the Nebraska Senator's issue, at least in this body, with reference to interim nuclear waste. We have satisfied the issue between the Senators from Tennessee and the committee. We are waiting for a colloquy on that. And, indeed, I believe we are real close to solving it with the Senate Committee on Armed Services for a colloquy with reference to our nuclear stockpile.

If we are able to work that out, whatever is left would be the Bumpers amendment, who—the Senator has at least told us about it. And we understand perhaps Senator BROWN has an amendment with reference to two of the commissions that we funded, or one of them. And Senator BROWN, and maybe Senator BROWN's staff could advise Senators, we would be ready for him shortly if he could come down. And I think maybe we have heard that there might be one on the Appalachian Regional Commission. We do not know that.

All right. That is all that we are aware of that will require debate. We have a number of amendments we will offer as chairman and ranking member

as we wrap this up. Some we will not be able to accept. And the Senators will have to understand that.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am prepared to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished Senators from Tennessee. We can either enter it in the RECORD or we can state it here on the floor, whichever they prefer. What is Senator THOMPSON's preference?

Mr. THOMPSON. The Senator will state it briefly.

I would like to state what I understand to be language that is agreed to by the managers of this bill. It is language which clarifies the intent of the committee and replaces references in the committee report on pages 96 and 97 with regard to the siting of the new spallation source project. Part of the agreed-upon language is as follows:

The conferees make no recommendation with regard to the siting of the new spallation source project. The Department of Energy shall make that determination in a fair and unbiased manner.

Am I correct in stating that this is part of the language that is agreed to for the purpose of legislative history?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is correct.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the following language is also agreed to by the managers:

The conferees direct the Department to evaluate opportunities to upgrade existing reactors and spallation sources as a cost-effective means of providing neutrons in the near term for the scientific community while the next generation source is developed. This evaluation shall be available prior to the Appropriations Committee's hearings on the Department's fiscal year 1997 budget submission.

Am I correct in stating that this language is also agreed to?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I just read it carefully, and I ask that one word be deleted, and then I will say we agree.

Where it says, on the second line of what the Senator read "spallation sources as a cost-effective means," I wonder if we can strike the word "a" and just say "sources as cost-effective means" instead of "a cost-effective means."

Mr. FRIST. That will be agreeable.

Mr. DOMENICI. If we strike that "a," then my answer to the Senator's question is that is absolutely correct.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I believe it is our further understanding that our conferees will seek to place

the agreed-upon language in the conference report; am I correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator is correct. Let me say to both Senators from Tennessee, it has been a pleasure working with them on this. They have been tenacious. We had a genuine discussion at length and we came up with something at least this Senator believes is workable and good for spallation and neutron acceleration in the future. I think that is a very important part of the necessary science for the United States.

I think the second part of it means that we will not fall behind while we proceed with the new major construction, and the first indicates that the Department will decide on a fair and equitable basis the site for the big machine, which will cost in excess of a billion dollars.

Mr. THOMPSON. This will help us move forward in those ways, and we appreciate the accommodation of the Senator from New Mexico and his willingness to work with us on this.

Mr. FRIST. We do appreciate it, Mr. President. It does reflect, I think, the critical importance placed on the Department of Energy's recommendations in making this site in the best way that they see fit in terms of overall systems development for the entire country.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank my colleagues. Mr. President, I wonder if any of the other Senators who arrived have amendments?

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague from New Mexico, we are right now attempting to see if we can work this out, if we could have a little more time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2054, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it has come to my attention, and I believe Senator JEFFORDS from Vermont agrees, that there is a typographical error in the amendment that the Senator offered, which has been agreed to by the Senate. So I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified, as per the amendment which I now send to the desk. This change is agreed upon by the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Louisiana, Senator JOHNSTON, and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to modification of the amendment previously adopted? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 20, after line 23 insert the following:

#### SEC. . FUNDING FOR ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES RELATING TO RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES.

“(a) REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount appropriated in title III of this Act under the heading Departmental Administration is hereby reduced by \$25,000,000.

“(b) INCREASE IN APPROPRIATION FOR ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount appropriated in title III of this act under the heading Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities is hereby increased by \$37,000,000.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the funds appropriated in title III of this Act under the heading Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities—

“(1) not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available for solar building technology research;

“(2) not less than 78,929,000 shall be available for photovoltaic energy systems;

“(3) not less than 28,443,000 shall be available for solar thermal energy systems;

“(4) not less than 55,300,000 shall be available for biofuels of which no less than half shall go toward the Biomass Electric Program;

“(5) not less than 42,000,000 shall be available for wind energy systems;

“(6) not less than 8,000,000 shall be available for international solar energy programs;

“(7) not less than 9,000,000 shall be available for hydrogen research.”

Mr. DOMENICI. Is it necessary to reconsider and table that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand that Senator BUMPERS is going to offer an amendment with reference to the water-cooled reactor. I understand he is willing to enter into a time agreement of 1 hour equally divided. I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally allocated to Senator BUMPERS and Senator JOHNSTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will check with Senator STEVENS and make sure that he can come down and be part of this argument.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And no second-degree amendments.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that no second-degree amendments be in order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Arkansas.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2055

(Purpose: To terminate the Gas Turbine-Modular Helium Reactor Program)

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator INHOFE, and Senator KERRY of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending committee amendment will be set aside.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. KERRY proposes an amendment numbered 2055.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike lines 22-23 on page 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$2,793,324,000 to remain available until expended. *Provided* That, no more than \$7,500,000 of such funds shall be used for the termination of the Gas Turbine-Modular Helium Reactor program."

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, this is a complicated subject dealing with \$12.5 million, not a lot of money around here. But considering the budget constraints we are operating under, we need to be very careful what we spend. It is, to use the technical term, \$12.5 million to continue the "gas turbine-modular helium reactor."

This is a project that has been around for a very long time. A lot of money has already been spent on the program. Make no mistake about it, we have put \$900 million into it, and industry has put almost as much. But it has been sagging simply because it is not viable. It is not viable technically within the time frame within which we ought to complete it and the National Academy of Sciences says you cannot leave plutonium lying around stored for the periods of time that you are likely to have to store it before this reactor is completed and has the ability to burn it.

In addition to that, the National Academy of Sciences says leaving plutonium stored is a dangerous proposition, and the longer you leave it stored, the more dangerous it becomes because of the threat of diversion of the plutonium to weapons.

The Academy does not like the program. I do not like it. A lot of people do not like it, and they do not want to spend any more money on it. The first reactor that was used for demonstration of this technology was in Pennsylvania back in 1967 to 1974. Then a larger commercial plant was built in Colorado. And after operating for 16 years, it was finally shut down because it could only operate 14 percent of the time.

Now, Mr. President, just like the super collider and a host of other technologies we have undertaken, including the liquid metal breeder reactor, there always comes a time to shut these things down. In 1993—and I hope all Senators will listen to this—the U.S. Senate, this body, voted 58-41 to terminate this program. But we got over to conference, which is so often the case, and we receded to the House and the project continued.

This year, the Appropriations Committee in the House provided \$20 mil-

lion to continue this thing, and Congressman Klug offered an amendment to kill it, and the vote to kill this project in the House this year was 306-121.

Now, what we have had here is a little shell game. We did not put any money in, and the House did. They did not put in any money, and we did. Now we are back to we did not have any money in it until it was offered in the Appropriations Committee a few days ago, after the House just got through killing this thing by 306 votes to 121. This is pork at its worst. There was \$12.5 million in the bill here on the floor right now. But do you know why? The Senator from Alaska—which was certainly his right—put it back in in committee. He won it there by 15-8. But Senator DOMENICI, in the chairman's mark, had torpedoed this thing. He left \$7.5 million in the budget to terminate. That is the termination cost.

Incidentally, my amendment only cuts \$5 million. The Senator from Alaska got \$12.5 million put back in. I am only cutting 5 of that because I agree with Senator DOMENICI. We ought to use that \$7.5 million to torpedo this project once and for all. The senior Senator from Texas, with whom I agree about 1 percent of the time, made what I thought was a good statement the other day in committee. He said, "When the Department of Energy, or anybody else, wants to get rid of something, why do we not, at least occasionally, if the bureaucrats want to get rid of it, honor their requests?" It is very seldom they want to.

When I think of all the unmet needs of this country, and when I think of all the pressures on the domestic discretionary spending side of this budget, and here the House has killed this thing almost 3-to-1, and you are talking about a project that would cost \$5.3 billion to complete—we are not talking about a bean bag here, Mr. President. The Federal share would be \$2.6 billion.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. BUMPERS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is not the \$5.3 billion figure the Senator refers to the amount for the new production reactor, which was a different design, and that was wholly financed by the United States?

Mr. BUMPERS. Repeat your question.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The \$5.3 billion figure the Senator refers to was for the new production reactor, which was designed several years ago, different from this design, and wholly supported by the United States and nothing by either foreign countries or by the domestic industry, is that not correct?

Mr. BUMPERS. Senator, DOE said that they would expect this to cost billions to complete.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Of whose dollars?

Mr. BUMPERS. Half Government and half private. That is the way the project has been operated so far.

Mr. JOHNSTON. But the \$5.3 billion was the cost of the new production reactor which was the tritium reactor for the manufacture of tritium, was it not?

Mr. BUMPERS. Senator, you could be right about that, I am not sure.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And there has been no cost put on this.

Mr. BUMPERS. Well, \$5.3 billion is \$5.3 billion.

Mr. JOHNSTON. This is a different design from the new production reactor on which the \$5.3 billion estimate was made.

Mr. BUMPERS. You are talking about something different from the gas turbine modular helium reactor?

Mr. JOHNSTON. This design is different. The initial design of the new production reactor had a steam cycle. This has no steam cycle and has a 50 percent higher efficiency.

Mr. BUMPERS. Let me just say that it is a different design reactor, but the figures I am using are sort of a horseback guess by the Department of Energy of what it would cost for the new design, not the old design.

Well, to get on with the story, we can always find some rationale to keep a project going—new design, old design, anything to keep the money flowing. But you ought to bear in mind, there has not been one single nuclear plant built in the last 20 years, and right now there is not one single utility in America that has any plans to build one.

So you are talking about 20 years we have not built one, and certainly if somebody started trying to license one now, it would take another 20 years, and nobody is going to license one under current technology ever again.

I started off confessing that I am not a physicist. I did not even have high school chemistry. These subjects are difficult to me. They are not difficult for the National Academy of Sciences.

Do you know what the National Academy said? The best argument that the Senator from Alaska can make, or anybody else can make, for going forward with this project is that this advanced reactor will burn plutonium. That is a highly desirable goal.

Everybody in the U.S. Senate wishes we could wave a wand and some new technology would appear to burn plutonium, get rid of it. One of the arguments that has consistently been made for this reactor is that is what it will do. I am not going to argue whether ultimately, after we spend \$5 billion, we might have something that would burn plutonium.

I want to make a couple of points. One I have already made, that burning plutonium in a new reactor is even more dangerous than our present situation, because it will be years and years and years before this reactor is ready. Meanwhile, we will have all this plutonium stored, and then even after we finish it, it will take years and years and years to burn it up, during which time it is always subject to a diversion—to Qadhafi, North Korea, or whoever.



A more compelling argument is the one the National Academy of Sciences made when they said, in 1992, "The committee believes that no funds should be allocated for development of high-temperature gas-cooled reactor technology within the commercial nuclear power development budget of DOE."

In addition to that, they have said there are two much more preferable ways to get rid of plutonium. One is to fabricate it with other fuel and burn it up; the other, which is essentially my favorite, is vitrification, a process which we have also spent a lot of money on and which so far as we know will pay rich dividends.

Now, Mr. President, further quoting the National Academy of Sciences, in their 1994 report said, "These advance reactor types themselves, however, are not economically competitive with other sources of power." Listen to that: "These advance reactor types themselves are not economically competitive with other sources of power," and the availability of plutonium as fuel does not make them economical. The storage of large stocks of weapons-plutonium—until such reactors become competitive, is not attractive for security reasons.

Now, Mr. President, none of the research for this goes on in my State. I do not know where it goes on. I do not have a dog in the fight. All I know is I have been waking up screaming for the last 6 months—not about a budget cut, not about trying to balance the budget, but about our priorities.

I spoke at the Governors School in my State last Saturday. There are 400 of the presumably brightest students in my State. They go to a 6-month school at a little liberal arts college called Hendrix College, where my sons went to school. When I walked out, a woman who accosted me said, "My son who is here will not be able to get a college education."

We did not elaborate on that. But we are cutting student loans, we are cutting income investments, earned income tax credits. We are going to wind up cutting welfare for the poorest of the poor. I have no objection to reforming welfare. We will wind up cutting food stamps. We are going to cut everything that affects about 30 to 40 percent of the people in this country, and we are going to increase defense spending \$7 billion above what the Defense Department says they want—\$7 billion above the President's request—but still, twice as much as virtually the rest of the world combined. Here is an opportunity to save a paltry \$5 million, and in the future, lord knows how many millions.

The National Taxpayers Union, the Citizens Against Government Waste, all those people are strongly in favor of this amendment, and torpedoing this technology, not once and for all, but at least for the foreseeable future, until the National Academy of Sciences says

it has a lot more promise than it has now.

I yield the floor. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield to the Senator from Alaska 10 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have authored the provision in the report that Senator BUMPERS' amendment seeks to delete because of my belief that this new technology, which has not been analyzed by the National Academy, may be critical to our energy future.

What I am trying to accomplish by the change that was made in the report is to create the availability of \$5 million to complete the study by the National Research Council of the technical feasibility and economic potential of GT-MHR for power generation.

I got into this because of my role in arms control. One of the problems we have run into is the destruction of plutonium. I have been told that this process will destroy plutonium as it is used to produce electric power.

As a matter of fact, I think the claim can truly be made that this new concept—and it is a new concept—has the potential to destroy weapons-grade plutonium and eliminate its proliferation potential.

If the Senator will look at the report on page 91, what we have done is increase the funding of \$5 million over the cost of the close-out of the program with the understanding that no more than the \$5 million is available until the National Research Council has completed its study and the results have been reported.

That means that the \$5 million is available to do just what the Senator from Arkansas says has not been done. It is available for making the study and to report to respective committees of Congress. If it finds that this process has as much potential as we believe it has, the program will not be closed down. It will be continued.

Now, this is an entirely new procedure. It is a concept of a gas-cooled reactor with a very high rate of efficiency. It is something that should be reviewed by the National Academy before the project is closed up.

Let me say that the Senator from Arkansas is right in one respect. The Government and industry have put \$1.5 billion into trying to find a technology to accomplish the results that the program originally sought of nuclear power generation meeting the safety requirements of our country.

One of the added benefits of this new concept is that it is possible for this gas turbine modular helium reactor to use plutonium for the purpose of generating power and at the same time accomplish the world's sought-after result of destroying plutonium.

I believe that this is something which the Senate should realize what we are trying to do, which is to get a review of the technology. The technology is much different from that which has been the subject of this vast

investment in the past. This is a technology which uses ceramic-coated fuel and uses inert helium as the heat transfer medium. It allows higher operating temperatures than can be found in the water-cooled reactors. The water-cooled reactors have been the ones used by the world's nuclear power plants.

This GT-MHR process uses higher temperature helium coolants directly to drive the turbine that drives the generator. As a result, the efficiency is much higher than the water-cooled reactors. But, what is more, it then has the side benefit that was brought to my attention, and that is that it will destroy weapons-grade plutonium so it can no longer be used for nuclear weapons. The GT-MHR not only destroys it and degrades it while generating electricity, it is really not even a problem as far as waste disposal. This has been one of the great difficulties with nuclear-powered generation in the past.

I believe that what we are trying to do is let the scientific community now analyze this new concept that is available, and only expend Federal money in the future, if GT-MHR is found to have the feasibility and economic potential as it has been represented by those who have developed it and presented it to the Department of Energy.

The Senator says this is pork. There are no nuclear reactors in my State. There is no helium in my State. There is nothing connected with this process in my State. I am the one that offered this amendment for one purpose only, to get the National Research Council to determine whether this process has the potential to accomplish two national benefits: First, to provide a process by which we can start developing an industry that can provide environmentally safe nuclear-generated energy; and, second, that the process that has been presented will in fact destroy plutonium at the 90-percent level in so accomplishing the first benefit. I think the second benefit is the one that is most important to the world.

There are enormous stakes here. There is no question about that. If this process proves valid, as people believe it will, this \$5 million may be the most important \$5 million we have ever invested. We are not investing it in the process. We are investing in investigating the process to determine if it has the potential as presented. If it does, then the research will continue with the \$7.5 million that was intended to be used to close out the program. And Congress will be directly involved in how much, if anything, the Federal Government will put into the further advancement of this concept.

But for now, what we are doing is saying \$5 million will be used during the period of the evaluation. That is the maximum that can be used to evaluate this process. After having spent \$1.5 billion in getting this from the very beginning of nuclear technology development to the present, and not having successfully found a process



that will meet our needs, it seems to me to be very little to ask that we put up \$5 million to check this latest technology.

This technology is important because it hinges on two different types of technology in order to be successful—the new gas turbine and the generator that has been used in the past. If the technology is proven to have the potential that we feel it does, then, I think we will have a program that will meet more than our national needs. It will meet the world's needs.

There are assertions that the Senator from Arkansas has made that I believe should be answered. I can answer them for the record. But I think the most important thing to note is that this has not been reviewed before at this level.

I will reserve what time I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes and ten seconds.

Mr. BUMPERS. Is 10 minutes sufficient for the Senator?

Mr. INHOFE. Five minutes is fine.

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding the time.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the Bumpers amendment to terminate the gas-turbine modular-helium-reactor program. For the past 30 years, the Department of Energy's program has only served as another Federal monetary waste. To date, the taxpayers have already spent \$900 million to advance gas-coolant reactor technology. One would imagine that after costing the American public nearly \$1 billion, we would see some type of tangible technological benefits. But this is not the case.

In 1992, the National Academy of Sciences study concluded that the gas-cooled reactor has low market potential. Last month the DOE stated in a report by the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board that it did not see any further need to continue to develop the program.

The report said—this is a quote we have not heard yet, I do not believe anyway, at least I have not:

This technology requires a very expensive, long-term development program that cannot be supported in the near future. Given industry's low interest in this technology, DOE has requested termination of the Gas Turbine Modular Helium Reactor Program.

But I have to say, Mr. President, that my concern is not a technical concern. Yes, I am concerned about the energy industry. I believe, had a lot of this money been spent to develop enhanced recovery programs and to do something to stop the demise of the domestic oil industry, I would be in strong support of it. That is where our money should have gone.

The GAO report estimates that the total cost to design and construct a gas-cooled reactor should be approximately \$5.3 billion, of which taxpayers are expected to absorb approximately 50 percent. Mathematics would tell us that we would save more than \$2 billion of hard-earned taxpayer dollars simply by going with the President, Congress, DOE, and the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, and the list goes on and on.

Congress has been trying to terminate funding for this program for the last several years. Finally, this year, the House adopted an amendment to eliminate the program altogether. Rightfully, the Senate Appropriations Committee authorized \$7.5 million to cover the Department of Energy's termination of this program. The administration, the Bush administration, the Reagan administration, Congress, scientists and many of the fiscal unions, such as the National Taxpayers Union, the National Tax Limitations Committee, the Citizens Against Government Waste, are united in their campaign to terminate the project. The Department of Energy, like the rest of us, must make massive budget cuts if we are to ever keep our commitment to the budget resolution that we made that would eliminate the deficit by the year 2002.

We can no longer afford such luxuries as the gas-cooled reactor that do not earn their Federal keep. With the possibility of the dismantling of DOE, the administration has made a wise decision to end the program that only serves as a liability.

America is watching both the House and the Senate as we bring Federal spending back under control. By supporting this amendment, we are legislating exactly the way we said we would last November by appropriating wisely and cutting out programs that continue to waste Federal dollars intended for future generations.

So, Mr. President, I am not as impressed as I should be, I guess, with the National Academy of Sciences, but I am impressed with the National Taxpayers Union and many of the groups that are looking at this from a fiscal perspective.

I would only say this is a good example of what Ronald Reagan said in one of the greater speeches I have ever heard, entitled "Rendezvous with Destiny," way back in 1965 when he said there is nothing closer to immortality on the face of this Earth than a Government program. I think this is such a program.

I yield back the time.

Mr. JOHNSTON addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

There is a lot of technology involved here, but the question is really quite simple. What the Stevens amendment does—and it is a very sound amend-

ment—it simply says that before we take this program, which has a promise of burning 85 to 95 percent of the plutonium which is put through the cycle—and that compares with 20 percent of plutonium which would be burned in a light-water reactor, but before we stop this technology which has that capacity, that hope of burning 85 to 95 percent of the plutonium, we get a report from the National Research Council, which is part of the National Academy of Sciences. No more than \$5 million may be spent until that evaluation takes place. That is all the amendment does.

We have done in this country research on these high-temperature gas reactors over a period of many years. This is a new design which has never been evaluated by the National Academy of Sciences. It is 50 percent more efficient than the previous design. It is the first design that has used the high-temperature helium gas directly against the turbine, which is a radical new design.

Moreover, the main reason we want to do this is because of plutonium burnout, but it also has the added advantage in that this reactor cannot melt down. Its fuel density and maximum temperature is less than the melt rate of the fuel. So if you lost all coolant, there would be no possibility of a meltdown of this reactor, which is one of the reasons that Mr. Mikhailov, who is the Russian Energy Minister, wants to build this reactor in a consortium with America. They have a proposal whereby they would put up half of the costs, and the net cost to the United States, if this were done, would be about \$350 million, not \$5.3 billion.

Mr. President, the fact is we do not know the answers to these questions about exactly what it would cost because, frankly, we need an evaluation by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences. Really, as a matter of prudence, we ought to have the National Academy of Sciences look at this brand new technology, this brand new design before we scrap this program in which so much has been invested, which has such hope not only for plutonium burnup but it has tremendous hope for being meltdown proof. It is what we call a passively safe reactor.

I might add, it also has the capacity and capability to make tritium in a re-configuration, which is the reason it was picked as the top candidate for the new production reactor. In any event, this is a very prudent thing to do, to have the National Academy of Sciences look at this matter before we scrap the reactor. And that is all the Stevens amendment does. It represents real progress. We are not committing this country by this amendment to build the reactor or to spend additional money but simply to have the National Academy of Sciences look at this design. That is all it does.

Mr. President, did the Senator from Alaska desire additional time at this point?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield me just a couple more minutes, I do not want to use it all because I want to respond in the end. But, I would like to reference the committee report, and I encourage my colleagues to read it.

The Committee understood that the GT-MHR has the capability of destroying 90 percent of weapons grade plutonium 239 when used alone and over 99 percent of the plutonium 239 when used in combination with an accelerator-driven reactor without the need of reprocessing or recycling of the material. The evaluation shall also include, therefore, a review of the technical capability of the reactor to accomplish the near total destruction of weapons grade plutonium alone or in combination with an accelerator without reprocessing and recycling. The study shall be supported by funds within this account and shall be completed no later than 90 days following the signing of this bill into law. If the results reported are positive, the balance of the funding shall be released to continue the development of the GT-MHR and, if negative, the balance of the funding shall be applied to the program closeout.

In other words, all we are doing is saying give the National Research Council an opportunity to review this before it is closed out. If they find that the Senator from Arkansas is correct, it will be closed out. If they find that those who have presented the process are correct, they will continue to analyze and find out how to apply this new technology to these two very vital world goals.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, and I must say to my friends I do so on a personal level with some reticence because I worked so closely with both the proponents of this. Nevertheless, I feel very strongly that this is one of the moments where Congress really needs to just make the cut. The House has voted by 306 to 121 to cut the funding for this. We have been toying around with this technology since 1970. We have spent now some \$900 million to date for the technology. But no commercial buyer is prepared to step up for this technology. Gas-cooled reactors employ what is known as a passive cooling system, and these do not allow for the use of conventional containment structures to prevent the release of radiation in case of accidents. That lack of containment could be a serious problem and would represent a major safety tradeoff.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. KERRY. Not on my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. On my time. If the Senator will yield.

Mr. KERRY. I yield but not on my time. If I can use the time of the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes. Just on my time on that point. The Senator said that they do not allow for the use of containment. You cannot put containment over a gas-cooled reactor. It is simply that it is not necessary because the fuel density and the temperature is such that it cannot melt down. You cannot have that kind of accident where hydrogen gas accumulates and you have an explosion and you need containment.

Mr. KERRY. Let me say to my friend—

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is that not correct?

Mr. KERRY. I am not suggesting you have a meltdown structure, but you could nevertheless have a release of radiation, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's advisory committee has suggested that they are not willing to accept these approaches. Moreover, in order for this technology to be competitive, you would have to complete the R&D phase, which would cost another \$700 million, and then in order to make the technology commercial, you are going to have to build a full-scale demonstration plant. You are going to have to operate that successfully for another \$1 billion.

Now, various reports of the National Academy of Sciences, the most recent of which was released this month, have unfailingly rejected this reactor technology for either mission, for the mission of providing energy or for the mission of getting rid of nuclear plutonium. So, Mr. President, if you look at what the Electric Power Research Institute, which is a research arm of the electric utility industry, said, they reported in 1991 that the HTGR was just not cost competitive. Now, if the private sector refuses to finance the R&D on a gas-cooled reactor, why should the taxpayers? It just does not make sense. I mean, this is one of those projects which we have got to have the courage to say it does not make sense economically, the science is not good. There are other alternative means of dealing with what is being proposed. This is the same argument as the ALMR. It took us 2 years to cut the ALMR. We cut it. But it was being proposed as a way of getting rid of nuclear unspent fuel.

I think that truly, Mr. President, this particular expenditure of \$900 million since 1970, chasing some kind of legitimate mission using taxpayers' money on an ongoing process, in a year when we are cutting education, we are cutting Medicare, we are cutting all of the other programs that are of such importance, and here we are once again trying to protect one of the great chases. Truly this is the kind of program that makes the wool and mohair subsidy look like support for the 101st Airborne or for cancer research. It simply does not stand up to scrutiny under the National Academy Of Sciences itself, under the private sector's own

judgments. And therefore, the U.S. Senate ought to step up to bat and terminate it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEVENS. Would the Senator yield me 1 minute for a question of my friend from Massachusetts?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Does the Senator understand that the \$5 million is for the study by the National Research Council? I do not understand how I can be accused of promoting pork when I am giving \$5 million to the council that you and I support. Why should we not give the money to the one council that ought to tell us if this process has the potential to destroy over 90 percent of the weapons grade plutonium in this country?

Mr. KERRY. My answer is the judgment has already significantly been made by the private sector and by the National Academy of Sciences that it is not worth pursuing.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, that is absolutely not true. This process has not been examined. The National Academy wrote to Senator BRADLEY on December 10, 1993, stating that they did not examine this GT-MHR process. That is precisely why we are giving the \$5 million so they will examine this process before we consider closing out the program.

Mr. KERRY. I do not use any more time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 12 minutes, 7 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator JOHNSTON?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 4 minutes, thirty seconds.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Does the Senator want to yield back the balance?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am sorry. I missed that.

How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes, thirty seconds.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I just want to say to my colleagues there are three powerful arguments for finally terminating this program which has been around for 30 years. One is the National Academy of Sciences that said there are two eminently better methods of using up plutonium: Fabricated fuel, and vitrification.

Second, this is a much more dangerous project because you have to store plutonium for much longer periods of time, and that subjects it to diversion for weapons use.

And third, we are headed for a \$5.3 billion project, 50 percent of which Uncle Sugar will have to put up.

Now, Mr. President, what do you have to do around here? The Department of Energy does not want it. The

National Academy of Sciences says it is a terrible idea. And the costs are staggering. What do you have to do to convince people to terminate something around here? The Senator from Alaska read from the committee report. I assume he wrote it. That is committee report language that he wrote. It has no technical value. And the Senator from Alaska says he wants to put \$5 million into this study. After 30 years, \$1,800,000,000, we are going to study it. And, Mr. President, here is what the Department of Energy said:

The Department does not support continued funding of the Gas Turbine Modular Helium Reactor. There are significant questions about the viability of this reactor type, including whether the fuel will retain fission products to the extent necessary for safety. There is little utility interest in this technology, and we believe that development of this reactor concept would require Federal expenditures in excess of \$1 billion [just] over the next decade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 2 minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I do not get into these things lightly, particularly coming from an oil producing State—the most significant oil producing State in the Union.

Now, I am arguing for this review by the National Research Council because of the report that came to us that this process will destroy plutonium. The Senator from Arkansas has repeatedly said that the National Academy has examined this process. That is not true. Again I point out that on December 10, 1993, in a letter to Senator BRADLEY, the chairman of the NAS committee stated that “The National Academy Committee did not examine and therefore could not evaluate the gas turbine reactor.” GT-MHR is a new process. And as the report says—and it is true that I did have something to do with writing that report—that the information we have is, that when combined with an accelerator, this GT-MHR process can destroy 99 percent of plutonium 239 while producing economically and environmentally sound electric power for the future of the country.

Now, I think the Senate should concentrate on what we have done. We have not said go ahead with this process. We have not said fund any more of this process. We have given \$5 million to the National Research Council and said, examine this process and report back to us in 90 days. If you find this process cannot live up to the claims, then go ahead and shut down the program with the \$7.5 million. If you find that it can, then report that back to the four committees and we will go further.

Now, I cannot think of anything more simple than the process of looking at what we have done. We have provided \$5 million for the evaluation of this unique, new process that the National Academy Committee did not ex-

amine, and could not evaluate because of the fact that it was not submitted to them. We are now submitting to them the gas turbine reactor program known as GT-MHR with a 90-day deadline and a maximum amount that they can spend for the evaluation of \$5 million. I think that is the fairest thing we can do for the taxpayers, particularly for those of us who are worried about what to do with plutonium.

What are we going to do with plutonium, Mr. President? Are we just going to let it sit out there and worry about how to destroy it? We cannot destroy it today. This system burns it. It is possible to burn 99 percent of it without cost to the taxpayers, and provide cheap electric energy in the process. We are going to spend billions of dollars to try to destroy this plutonium. This process could destroy it while producing normal utility electric power for our consumption. Now I think it is a very fine process. I hope it is evaluated and I urge the Senate to vote against this amendment.

Mr. BUMPERS. Is the Senator from Louisiana prepared to yield back time?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of the time.

Mr. BUMPERS. I yield back the balance of my time, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to say to Senators who are coming down now, to vote, could you search your offices and your minds and see whether you have any other amendments? We would like very much to get a list right after this. We know of four amendments. If there are any others, we would like to know about them. We are not seeking time agreements yet, just to see how many there are because we would like to tell our leaders what this looks like for the remainder of the evening.

So if Senators have any amendments that they want to offer, can they get us information? Maybe we will accept some of them. It will very much help us in our endeavor to get through at an early hour. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2055. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 347 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Abraham	Exon	McCain
Akaka	Feingold	Moynihan
Baucus	Feinstein	Murray
Biden	Glenn	Nickles
Bingaman	Graham	Nunn
Boxer	Gramm	Pell
Bradley	Grassley	Pryor
Brown	Gregg	Reid
Bryan	Hatfield	Robb
Bumpers	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Campbell	Jeffords	Roth
Chafee	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Coats	Kennedy	Simon
Cohen	Kerrey	Simpson
Conrad	Kerry	Smith
Coverdell	Kohl	Snowe
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Specter
Daschle	Leahy	Thomas
Dodd	Levin	Warner
Domenici	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dorgan	Mack	

NAYS—38

Ashcroft	Gorton	Lugar
Bennett	Grams	McConnell
Bond	Harkin	Mikulski
Breaux	Hatch	Moseley-Braun
Burns	Heflin	Murkowski
Byrd	Helms	Packwood
Cochran	Hollings	Pressler
Craig	Hutchison	Santorum
DeWine	Inouye	Shelby
Dole	Johnston	Stevens
Faircloth	Kempthorne	Thompson
Ford	Kyl	Thurmond
Frist	Lott	

So the amendment (No. 2055) was agreed to.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to table the motion.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCAIN). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, fellow Senators, let me ask again, if any Members have amendments that we will vote on, I would like to know about it. I assume the same holds true for Senator JOHNSTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

We know we have a Dorgan amendment that is ready to go.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me tell Members what I know, and Senators on our side, if you have something to add to this, I would appreciate it.

Senator GRAMS has an amendment with reference to the Appalachia Regional Commission. I assume Senator GRAMS would be ready at some point on that.

Senator WELLSTONE has a water level amendment. We would have to oppose that. I would like very much for him to be ready soon.

Senator BROWN's amendment has been solved. Senator DORGAN has a sense-of-the-Senate on line-item veto, is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am advised Senator DORGAN says his side could take 10 minutes; I suppose our side could take even less than that. I suggest 20 minutes equally divided.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we have to check that out. We will see where we are.

Are there any other amendments that Senators have that might be offered?

Mr. BUMPERS. Does the Senator from New Mexico have my amendment?

Mr. DOMENICI. No.

Mr. BUMPERS. It is regarding the \$65 million for a cancer institute.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, how much time would the Senator from Arkansas want on that amendment?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I want to accommodate the expedient disposition of this bill. I suggest an hour, and we will try to cut it to 30 or 40 minutes. One hour equally divided.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Why do we not cut it to 30 or 40 minutes going into debate?

Mr. BUMPERS. It is not always easy to get the unanimous consent to extend the time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me suggest that your amendment will be very controversial, and I think the Senator understands that.

Without setting time agreements, I would like to see what the amendments are. If you have one that has to do with the superconducting super collider closedown—

Mr. BUMPERS. That is the only one we have.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be in order, and there be second-degree amendments permissible on any of them: Senator GRAMS on Appalachia, Senator WELLSTONE on water level, Senator DORGAN on a sense-of-the-Senate on line-item veto, and Senator BUMPERS on superconducting super collider, and that there be no other amendments in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the Senator would yield, we have a package of agreed amendments. If you could make an exception to that, accept those which are cleared by managers on both sides.

Second-degree amendments were permitted or not permitted?

Mr. DOMENICI. I cannot follow because I cannot hear.

Now, Mr. President, could I propose a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FEINGOLD. If the Senator would yield for a moment, I did have an amendment that we are trying to work out. At this point, I reserve a spot, in case we do not work it out.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will try it again.

I was going to clear Senator Abraham's amendment.

Senator HUTCHISON would like to inquire, a little more specifically, of Senator BUMPERS and see if we cannot get an agreement. Could the Senator tell the Senator from Texas precisely what his amendment would do?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, briefly, when we terminated the superconducting super collider, we entered into an agreement with the State of Texas, which was obligated at that time to spend close to \$1 billion. They had already spent quite a bit of it.

I guess you would say there were two parts of the termination agreement. One dealt with the employees severance package; the other was with the

State of Texas. There was \$65 million that the Federal Government was going to put up to assist Texas in building a cancer institute on the site where the super collider was being built.

Texas has now decided that they will not build the cancer institute there and wants us to give them the \$65 million. My amendment would rescind the \$65 million.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas seek recognition?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I understand what the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas does. I will oppose the amendment because it was part of the package deal that the Federal Government agreed with the State of Texas to do. Although there was a change, we will discuss that during the amendment.

My question is, when is this amendment going to be brought up and what is the proposed time agreement for the unanimous consent?

Mr. BUMPERS. I will defer to the distinguished floor manager on that.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I say to the Senator from Texas and other Senators, I was not looking for a time agreement. I was merely looking to establish a list of primary amendments and see if we could agree on those, and then we will work out time agreements and maybe even work out some of the amendments.

It will be sometime this evening. I understand that is not necessarily in the best interests of the Senator from Texas, but we have been asked to complete this bill today.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, just one other point. This would put this bill on all fours with the House bill which has already done what my amendment would do.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the only amendments that be in order on this bill are the Grams amendment on Appalachia; Wellstone; Dorgan on line-item veto—these amendments are subject to second-degree amendments—Senator FEINGOLD on TVA; Senator HARKIN on hydrogen research; and Senator PRESSLER; I understand we are exempting any amendments that could be agreed upon by the two managers; and Senator ABRAHAM has an amendment he will offer right quick that we are going to accept, so that would be subject to both managers' agreement.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We would need a Byrd second-degree amendment to the Grams amendment, and a Byrd first-degree relevant amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. What is the Byrd second-degree amendment beyond Grams? What was the second one?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Second degree to the Grams amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. And that is all? You did not have another one on Byrd?

Mr. JOHNSTON. And a Byrd first-degree relevant amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. OK.

Let us add to the unanimous-consent request the following: A Byrd second-degree amendment to the Grams amendment, a Byrd relevant amendment, and a Burns relevant amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold the request, I am advised we need to hotline it and we will try to do so very quickly.

Mr. DOMENICI. OK. I withhold.

Let us proceed.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. BUMPERS. Will the Senator from Michigan yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. ABRAHAM. I will.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I misspoke myself a while ago and in fairness to the Senator from Texas I want to correct it. The amendment is what the Congressman from the district where the super collider is located tried to do in the House, but because of the House rule, was not permitted to offer the amendment.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If the Senator will yield for a minute, I know that was what was meant and I appreciate his correcting it because I think the Congressman does not understand the agreement. We will debate this fully but it is not the House bill and, of course, I am going to try to keep it from being in the Senate bill as well.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator ABRAHAM, I had agreed to accept the Senator's amendment and then Senator MACK wanted some time so I will yield to him after the Senator's amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2056

(Purpose: To repeal section 7 of the Magnetic Fusion Energy Engineering Act)

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment I think will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator, under the present parliamentary situation it will require the pending amendment be set aside.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be set aside. This is an amendment on behalf of myself as well as Senators GRAMS and KYL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM] for himself, Mr. GRAMS and Mr. KYL, proposes an amendment numbered 2056.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 41, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

**SEC. 510. MAGNETIC FUSION ENERGY ENGINEERING.**

Section 7 of the Magnetic Fusion Energy Engineering Act (42 U.S.C. 9396) is repealed.

**SEC. 511. REPEAL OF REPORT ON VERIFICATION TECHNIQUES FOR PRODUCTION OF PLUTONIUM AND HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM.**

Section 3131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 104 Stat. 1839) is amended by striking out subsection (c).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I will speak briefly to the amendment.

Earlier this summer, the Congress adopted a historic budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend for a moment, the Chair notes the Senate is still not in order. Please extend courtesy to the Senator from Michigan. The Senate is still not in order.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, in putting together the budget I think Members on all sides worked hard to try to identify various departments, agencies, commissions, boards, and councils whose functions were either unnecessary or duplicative of other activities going on in Government.

Working in conjunction with a number of my fellow freshman Members of this body, we have tried using the assumptions made in that budget, using suggestions that have been previously made by the GAO, by the CBO, in some cases by the President in the budget submission he made, to try to identify numerous agencies of Government which no longer fill their purpose and which consequently ought to be terminated. The purpose of this amendment, and it is the first of several we will be bringing during the course of the appropriations debates, is to bring to an end to these various no longer necessary Government agencies.

The amendment I am offering today will repeal the authorization of two technical panels who have outlived their usefulness, the Technical Committee on Verification of Fissile Material and Nuclear Warhead Controls and the Technical Panel on Magnetic Fusion. Neither of these panels currently receives funding. Nor do they have the support of either Congress or the executive branch. In other words, they are deadwood that should be cleared away as part of the process of balancing the budget.

Mr. President, Congress has the opportunity to produce something a vast majority of Americans want very deeply, a balanced budget. But to do so means trimming the fat from Government and cutting spending. This amendment represents a step in that direction. It terminates the activities of two Federal panels whose job is either finished or never began.

More important, it sets the tone I believe we should adopt with all of our spending bills. And so, as I said, from time to time during the appropriations process, a number of us are going to be

working together bringing other similar amendments to the floor in the hope we can produce the tangible reduction of numerous activities, agencies, and programs in Government that have outlived their usefulness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator ASHCROFT as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I yield the floor.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, did we adopt the amendment?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2056) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, before Senator MACK speaks I wonder if I could ask Senator GRAMS if he would let us follow a routine, now. Senator DORGAN has also been waiting on a line-item veto sense-of-the-Senate. He would agree to 15 minutes per side. Could we have him go next and then the Senator would follow immediately after that?

Mr. GRAMS. That will be fine.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from North Dakota.

**AMENDMENT NO. 2057**

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on the conference on S. 4, the Line Item Veto Act)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have an amendment No. 2057 at the desk which I would like to call up. Is there an amendment pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is set aside.

Mr. DORGAN. I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. FORD, Mr. ROBB, Mr. BREAU, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. WELLSTONE proposes an amendment numbered 2057.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

**SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CONFERENCE ON S. 4, THE LINE ITEM VETO ACT.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the line item veto was a major plank in the House majority's "Contract with Amer-

ica" and has received strong bipartisan support in the 104th Congress;

(2) the House of Representatives on February 6, 1995, passed H.R. 2, the Line Item Veto Act, on a vote of 294-134;

(3) the Senate on March 23, 1995, passed S. 4, the Separate Enrollment and Line Item Veto Act of 1995, on a vote of 69-29;

(4) the House passed S. 4, with the text of H.R. 2 inserted, by voice vote on May 17, 1995, 50 days after passage by the Senate;

(5) notwithstanding the failure of the House to request a conference, the Senate disagreed with the House amendment, requested a conference and appointed conferees on S. 4 on June 20, 1995;

(6) the papers for S. 4 have been held at the desk of the Speaker of the House for 42 days and the Speaker of the House has not yet moved to appoint conferees;

(7) with the passage of time it increasingly appears that the Congress may pass and send to the President not only the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1996 but also the reconciliation bill required by H. Con. Res. 67 (the concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002) without first passing and sending to the President a line item veto bill; and

(8) the House majority leadership has publicly cast doubt on the prospects for a conference on S. 4 this year.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Speaker of the House should move to appoint conferees on S. 4 immediately, so that the House and Senate may resolve their differences on this important legislation;

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, are we operating under a time agreement by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been formally entered into.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on this amendment there be 15 minutes on a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if Senator DORGAN will do me a favor. I forgot, I left Senator MACK standing. He had been recognized and I asked him if he would wait for us and I did not go back to him. He wants to speak for 2 minutes and then it will be Mr. DORGAN's turn on the amendment.

Mr. DORGAN. Of course, I will be happy to do that. It is my understanding there will not be a second-degree on my amendment, and I will have an up-or-down vote on my amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is my understanding.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

**PRESIDENT CLINTON'S STATEMENT ON LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS**

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, earlier today, in a statement made by President Clinton, he said he was planning to veto the legislative appropriations bill, and I find that, frankly, very disappointing. There have been many press reports suggesting the Clinton White House is in a constant campaign mode. His decision to veto the bill is clearly the decision of candidate Clinton, not President Clinton. Candidate